arXiv:1405.4296v2 [math.KT] 11 Dec 2014

Another presentation for symplectic Steinberg groups*

Andrei Lavrenov†

Abstract

We solve a classical problem of centrality of symplectic K_2, namely we show that for an arbitrary commutative ring R, $l \geq 3$, the symplectic Steinberg group $\mathrm{StSp}(2l, R)$ as an extension of the elementary symplectic group $\mathrm{Ep}(2l, R)$ is a central extension. This allows to conclude that the explicit definition of symplectic $\mathrm{K_2Sp}(2l, R)$ as a kernel of the above extension, i.e. as a group of non-elementary relations among symplectic transvections, coincides with the usual implicit definition via plus-construction.

We proceed from van der Kallen's classical paper, where he shows an analogous result for linear K-theory. We find a new set of generators for the symplectic Steinberg group and a defining system of relations among them. In this new presentation it is obvious that the symplectic Steinberg group is a central extension.

Introduction

The main result of the present paper is centrality of $\mathrm{K_2Sp}(2l, R)$ in the symplectic Steinberg group over an arbitrary commutative ring R and $l \geq 3$.

Centrality of the usual linear $\mathrm{K}_2(n, R)$ for $n \geq 4$ was proven by van der Kallen in [51] and Tulenbaev in [36] for a commutative and an almost

*Keywords: K-Theory, symplectic group, Steinberg groups, another presentation, centrality of K_2; MSC: 19C09.

†The author acknowledges support of the State Financed research task 6.38.191.2014 "Structure theory, classification, geometry, arithmetic and K-theory of algebraic groups and related structures" at the St. Petersburg State University, the Chebyshev Laboratory (Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, St. Petersburg State University) under RF Government grant 11.G34.31.0026, JSC "Gazprom Neft", RFBR project 13-01-00709 "Study of algebraic groups over rings by localization methods", RFBR project 13-01-92699 "Classical algebraic K-theory and algebraic groups" and the Möbius Contest Foundation for Young Scientists.

commutative ring R, respectively. Bak and Tang announced in 1998 that they work on a similar result for unitary groups, but it is a huge project and their proofs have not yet been published. Their results would imply ours for $l \geq 5$, however our proof works for $l \geq 3$ as well. As shown by Wendt in [37], centrality of the symplectic K_2 does not hold for $l = 2$.

Centrality of symplectic K_2 is known at the stable level, i.e., for the limit groups $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(R) = \varinjlim \mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l, R)$, or, in fact, once surjective stability of K_2 starts (see [33] and also [7,25]). In [35] it is shown that surjective stability holds for rings whose stable rank is small enough with respect to the rank l of the root system, for instance, for local rings (see also [7,12,44,48]). In [12] Stepanov shows in particular that K_2 is central for a ring R if and only if it is central for the factor-ring $R/\mathrm{Rad}\, R$, where $\mathrm{Rad}\, R$ denotes the Jacobson radical of R.

The starting point of our approach is van der Kallen's beautiful idea of "another presentation" for Steinberg groups [51]. The large part of our techniques is a symplectic analogue of his results. We find another set of generators for the symplectic Steinberg group and establish a nice behaviour of these new generators under conjugation. After that the claim is immediate. Another important idea used in the proof was suggested by Vavilov and Stepanov in [14]. They notice that the elementary symplectic group can be generated by long-root unipotents. Similarly, the symplectic Steinberg group is generated by long-root unipotents, defined in the present paper.

The main result of the present paper can be stated as follows.

Main Theorem. *Let R be an arbitrary commutative ring, $l \geq 3$, let ϕ denote the natural projection $\phi\colon \mathrm{StSp}(2l, R) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Ep}(2l, R)$, and let $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l, R)$ be its kernel $\mathrm{Ker}\, \phi$. Then one has*

$$\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l, R) \leq \mathrm{Cent}\, \mathrm{StSp}(2l, R),$$

or, in other words, ϕ is a central extension.

As a consequence one can conclude that for $l \geq 4$ the group $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l, R)$ is the Schur multiplier of the elementary symplectic group, $\mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{Ep}(2l, R), \mathbb{Z})$. This follows from a standard fact of the theory of central extensions. Namely if $\pi\colon G \twoheadrightarrow H$ is a central extension such that G is super-perfect (i.e. $\mathrm{H}_1(G, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathrm{H}_2(G, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$), then $\mathrm{H}_2(H, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathrm{Ker}\, \pi$. The proof of this fact immediately follows from the Lyndon–Hochschild–Serre spectral sequence (see [25, 43] for details). It is well-known that various Steinberg groups are super-perfect under appropriate conditions (see [2,3,7–9,22–25,33,34,43,50, 52]). In particular, Stein shows in [33] that $\mathrm{StSp}(2l, R)$ is super-perfect for $l \geq 4$. Thus, the Main Theorem implies the following result.

Corollary 1. *In notation of the Main Theorem assume in addition that* $l \geq 4$. *Then one has*

$$\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R) = \mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{Ep}(2l,\, R),\, \mathbb{Z}).$$

The above corollary can be generalised to the case $l = 3$. More precisely, consider a "universal covering" of $\mathrm{StSp}(6,\, R)$, i.e. a central extension $\pi\colon U \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{StSp}(6,\, R)$ such that U is super-perfect (it exists since $\mathrm{StSp}(6,\, R)$ is perfect, see [25,43] for details). Then $\phi\pi\colon U \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Ep}(6,\, R)$ is itself a central extension, so that we have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
1 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{StSp}(6,\, R), \mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & U & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathrm{StSp}(6,\, R) & \longrightarrow & 1 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \| & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi} & & \\
1 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{Ep}(6,\, R), \mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & U & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Ep}(6,\, R) & \longrightarrow & 1
\end{array}$$

with exact rows. Now, the snake lemma provides the exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{StSp}(6,\, R), \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{Ep}(6,\, R), \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(6,\, R) \longrightarrow 1.$$

Since $\mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{StSp}(6,\, R), \mathbb{Z})$ is computed in [34, 52] for an arbitrary R, one can now compare $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R)$ and $\mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{Ep}(2l,\, R),\, \mathbb{Z})$ for $l = 3$. Using results of [52] one obtains the following generalisation of the previous corollary.

Corollary 2. *In notation of the Main Theorem there is a surjective map from* $\mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{Ep}(2l,\, R),\, \mathbb{Z})$ *onto* $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R)$ *with the kernel* $\mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R), \mathbb{Z})$. *In particular, this map is bijective for* $l \geq 4$ *or for* $l = 3$ *provided that* R *has no residue field isomorphic to* $\mathbb{F}_2$.

The above corollaries establish coincidence of the classical definition of $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}$ as above with Quillen's symplectic K-theory. Recall that given a connected based CW-complex X and a perfect subgroup E in $\pi_1(X) = G$ one can construct a new CW-complex X^+ by attaching 2-cells and 3-cells such that $\pi_1(X) \to \pi_1(X^+)$ is the natural projection $G \twoheadrightarrow G/E$ and induced maps on homologies are isomorphisms. Quillen used this construction to define higher K-groups. The same construction can be applied to define K-theory of Chevalley groups as well, see [44]. In particular, taking $G = \mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R)$, $E = \mathrm{Ep}(2l,\, R)$ and $X = \mathrm{B}G$ one obtains the definition of Quillen's symplectic K-theory

$$\mathrm{K}_i\mathrm{Sp}^Q(2l,\, R) = \pi_i(\mathrm{B}G^+).$$

Such a definition automatically implies that Quillen's $\mathrm{K}_1\mathrm{Sp}^Q(2l,\, R)$ coincides with the classical one $\mathrm{K}_1\mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R) = \mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R)/\,\mathrm{Ep}(2l,\, R)$ (which, as

a matter of fact, coincides with Volodin's one). One can show that $\mathrm{B}E^+$ is homotopy equivalent to the universal covering of $\mathrm{B}G^+$ (see [44]). Thus, $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}^Q(2l,\, R) = \pi_2(\mathrm{B}G^+) = \pi_2(\mathrm{B}E^+)$, so that it is equal to $\mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{B}E^+)$ by Hurewicz theorem. Since the plus-construction preserves homologies, and homologies of $\mathrm{B}E$ are equal to homologies of E, one can conclude that $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}^Q(2l,\, R) = \mathrm{H}_2(E, \mathbb{Z})$. In other words, the Main Theorem of the present paper allows to compare definitions of K_2 via Steinberg groups and via the plus-construction.

Corollary 3. *In notation of the Main Theorem there is a surjective map from* $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}^Q(2l,\, R)$ *onto* $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R)$ *with the kernel* $\mathrm{H}_2(\mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R), \mathbb{Z})$. *In particular, this map is bijective for* $l \geq 4$ *or for* $l = 3$ *provided that* R *has no residue field isomorphic to* $\mathbb{F}_2$.

The second major result of the present paper is another presentation for the symplectic Steinberg group. As above, it is a symplectic analogue of van der Kallen's result for the linear case. More precisely, we have the following theorem.

Another Presentation. *In notation of the Main Theorem the symplectic Steinberg group* $\mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R)$ *can be defined by the set of generators*

$$\big\{X(u,\, v,\, a)\,\big|u,\, v \in V,\ u \text{ is a column of a symplectic elementary matrix},\ \langle u,\, v\rangle = 0,\ a \in R\big\}$$

and relations

$$X(u,\, v,\, a)X(u,\, w,\, b) = X(u,\, v + w,\, a + b + \langle v,\, w\rangle), \tag{P1}$$

$$X(u,\, va,\, 0) = X(v,\, ua,\, 0) \text{ where } v \text{ is also a column of a symplectic elementary matrix}, \tag{P2}$$

$$X(u',\, v',\, b)X(u,\, v,\, a)X(u',\, v',\, b)^{-1} = X(T(u',\, v',\, b)u,\, T(u',\, v',\, b)v,\, a), \tag{P3}$$

where $T(u,\, v,\, a)$ *is an ESD-transformation*

$$w \mapsto w + u(\langle v,\, w\rangle + a\langle u,\, w\rangle) + v\langle u,\, w\rangle.$$

For the usual generators of the symplectic Steinberg group the following identities hold

$$X_{ij}(a) = X(e_i,\, e_{-j}a\varepsilon_{-j},\, 0) \text{ for } j \neq -i, \qquad X_{i,-i}(a) = X(e_i,\, 0,\, a),$$

and, moreover, ϕ sends $X(u, v, a)$ to $T(u, v, a)$. Furthermore, the following relations are automatically satisfied

$$X(u, ua, 0) = X(u, 0, 2a), \tag{P4}$$

$$X(ub, 0, a) = X(u, 0, ab^2), \tag{P5}$$

$$X(u + v, 0, a) = X(u, 0, a)X(v, 0, a)X(v, ua, 0) \text{ for } \langle u, v\rangle = 0, \tag{P6}$$

whenever ub in P5 *or v and $u + v$ in* P6 *are also columns of symplectic elementary matrices.*

Formally, the first theorem follows from the second one, but the proof of the above presentation crucially depends on all intermediate results, necessary for the Main Theorem.

I would like to express my gratitude to Nikolai Vavilov, who supervised this work and also suggested numerous improvements in the exposition. I would also like to thank Alexei Stepanov for helpful discussions, Sergey Sinchuk, who partially motivated me to start this research, and Alexander Luzgarev, Andrei Smolensky and Alexander Shchegolev for their careful reading of the drafts of this paper.

1 Notations

In the sequel R denotes an arbitrary associative commutative unital ring, $V = R^{2l}$ denotes a free right R-module with basis numbered e_{-l}, …, e_{-1}, e_1, …, e_l, $l \geq 3$. For the vector $v \in V$ its i-th coordinate will be denoted by v_i, i.e. $v = \sum_{i=-l}^{l} e_i v_i$. By $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ we denote the standard symplectic form on V, i.e $\langle e_i, e_j\rangle = \mathrm{sgn}(i)\delta_{i,-j}$. We will usually write ε_i instead of $\mathrm{sgn}(i)$. Observe that $\langle u, u\rangle = 0$ for any $u \in V$.

Definition. Define the *symplectic group* $\mathrm{Sp}(V) = \mathrm{Sp}(2l, R)$ as the group of automorphisms of V preserving the symplectic form $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$,

$$\mathrm{Sp}(V) = \{f \in \mathrm{GL}(V) \mid \langle f(u), f(v)\rangle = \langle u, v\rangle \ \ \forall\, u, v \in V\}.$$

Definition (Eichler–Siegel–Dickson transformations)**.** For $a \in R$ and u, $v \in V$, $\langle u, v\rangle = 0$, denote by $T(u, v, a)$ the automorphism of V s.t. for $w \in V$ one has

$$T(u, v, a)\colon w \mapsto w + u(\langle v, w\rangle + a\langle u, w\rangle) + v\langle u, w\rangle.$$

We refer to the elements $T(u, v, a)$ as the (*symplectic*) *ESD-transformations.*

This definition follows Petrov's paper [46]. It simultaneously generalises short-root unipotents $T_{u,v}(a) = T(u, va, 0)$ and long-root unipotents $T_u(a) = T(u, 0, a)$. In general, an ESD-transformation is a product of a long-root unipotent and a short-root one, $T(u,\, v,\, a) = T_u(a)\, T_{u,v}(1)$.

The following properties of ESD-transformations can be verified by a straightforward computation.

Lemma 1. *Let $u,\, v,\, w \in V$ be three vectors such that $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, $\langle u,\, w\rangle = 0$, and let $a,\, b \in R$. Then*

a) $T(u,\, v,\, a) \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$,

b) $T(u,\, v,\, a)\, T(u,\, w,\, b) = T(u,\, v + w,\, a + b + \langle v,\, w\rangle)$,

c) $T(u,\, va,\, 0) = T(v,\, ua,\, 0)$,

d) $g\, T(u,\, v,\, a) g^{-1} = T(gu,\, gv,\, a) \quad \forall\, g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$.

Remark. Observe that $T(u,\, 0,\, 0) = 1$ and $T(u,\, v,\, a)^{-1} = T(u,\, -v,\, -a)$.

In the following particular case we have a simple commutator formula for ESD-transformations. In the present paper all commutators are left-normed, $[x,\, y] = xyx^{-1}y^{-1}$, we denote xyx^{-1} by ${}^{x}y$.

Lemma 2. *For $u,\, v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = v_i = v_{-i} = 0$, $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, and $a \in R$ one has*

$$[T(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, T(e_{-i},\, v,\, a)] = T(u,\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a) T(e_{-i},\, -ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0).$$

Proof. The proof is a direct computation using properties of ESD-transvections stated above. Firstly, using the conjugation formula one can rewrite the commutator in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
&[T(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, T(e_{-i},\, v,\, a)] = T(e_i,\, u,\, 0) \cdot {}^{T(e_{-i},\, v,\, a)}T(e_i,\, -u,\, 0) = \\
&= T(e_i,\, u,\, 0) T(T(e_{-i},\, v,\, a) e_i,\, -T(e_{-i},\, v,\, a) u,\, 0) = \\
&= T(e_i,\, u,\, 0) T(e_i + e_{-i} a \varepsilon_{-i} + v\varepsilon_{-i},\, -u,\, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using b) and c) of Lemma 1 one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
&T(e_i,\, u,\, 0) T(e_i + e_{-i} a \varepsilon_{-i} + v\varepsilon_{-i},\, -u,\, 0) = \\
&= T(u,\, e_i,\, 0) T(u,\, -e_i + e_{-i} a \varepsilon_i + v\varepsilon_i,\, 0) = T(u,\, e_{-i} a \varepsilon_i + v\varepsilon_i,\, a) = \\
&= T(u,\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a) T(u,\, e_{-i} a \varepsilon_i,\, 0) = T(u,\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a) T(e_{-i},\, -ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we define the elementary symplectic group and its combinatorial analogue, the symplectic Steinberg group, explicitly defined by generators and relations.

Definition. Define $T_{ij}(a) = T(e_i, e_{-j}a\varepsilon_{-j}, 0)$ and $T_{i,-i}(a) = T(e_i, 0, a)$, where $a \in R$, $i,\ j \in \{-l, \dots, -1, 1, \dots, l\}$, $i \notin \{\pm j\}$. We refer to these elements as the *elementary symplectic transvections*. The subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(V)$ they generate is called the *elementary symplectic group*

$$\mathrm{Ep}(V) = \mathrm{Ep}(2l, R) = \langle T_{ij}(a) \mid i \neq j,\ a \in R \rangle \leq \mathrm{Sp}(V).$$

Our choice of long-root elementary transvections $T_{i,-i}(a)$ coincides with that in [46]. The usual choice of sign differs from ours, namely for $2\chi_i \in C_l$ a long root, the corresponding elementary transvection is $x_{2\chi_i}(a) = T_{i,-i}(a\varepsilon_i)$. Notice also that $T_{ii}(a)$ are not defined.

Definition. The *symplectic Steinberg group* $\mathrm{StSp}(2l, R)$ is the group generated by the formal symbols $X_{ij}(a)$, $i \neq j$, $a \in R$ subject to the Steinberg relations

$$X_{ij}(a) = X_{-j,-i}(-a\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_j), \tag{R0}$$
$$X_{ij}(a)X_{ij}(b) = X_{ij}(a+b), \tag{R1}$$
$$[X_{ij}(a),\ X_{hk}(b)] = 1,\ \text{for } h \notin \{j, -i\},\ k \notin \{i, -j\}, \tag{R2}$$
$$[X_{ij}(a),\ X_{jk}(b)] = X_{ik}(ab),\ \text{for } i \notin \{-j, -k\},\ j \neq -k, \tag{R3}$$
$$[X_{i,-i}(a),\ X_{-i,j}(b)] = X_{ij}(ab\varepsilon_i)X_{-j,j}(-ab^2), \tag{R4}$$
$$[X_{ij}(a),\ X_{j,-i}(b)] = X_{i,-i}(2ab\varepsilon_i). \tag{R5}$$

Clearly, we assume that both sides in each relation are defined, in particular, that undefined elements of type $X_{ii}(a)$ do not appear. For example, R3 and R4 can be written only for $i \neq k$, thus we do not have any Steinberg relation compraising $[X_{kj}(a),\ X_{jk}(b)]$.

The next lemma is a straightforward consequence of Lemmas 1 and 2.

Lemma 3. *There is a natural epimorphism* $\phi\colon \mathrm{StSp}(2l, R) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Ep}(2l, R)$ *sending the generators* $X_{ij}(a)$ *to the corresponding elementary transvections* $T_{ij}(a)$. *In other words, the Steinberg relations hold for the elementary transvections.*

It is well-known that the elementary subgroup is normal in the symplectic group (see [19, 45]). For the general linear group over an arbitrary commutative ring a similar result was first obtained by Suslin in [15], see [27, 36, 53]

for generalisations. Later analogous results were obtained in larger generality: for classical groups in [11, 16–18, 29, 30, 38, 39, 48], for Chevalley groups in [20, 21, 26, 28], for unitary groups in [1–4, 6, 31, 32, 40–42, 47]. For further generalisations see [5,10,13,46,49]. An overview on this subject can be found in [7,14,42]. In fact, the proof of centrality of K_2 is based on the same ideas as the proof of normality of the elementary subgroup.

Definition. Consider ϕ as a map from the Steinberg group to the symplectic group. Then its cokernel is denoted by $\mathrm{K}_1\mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R)$ and its kernel is denoted by $\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R)$,

$$\mathrm{K}_2\mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R) \rightarrowtail \mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{K}_1\mathrm{Sp}(2l,\, R).$$

Now, all the necessary notations are introduced and we can outline the proof of the Main Theorem.

The goal is to define specific elements $X(u,\, v,\, a) \in \phi^{-1}T(u,\, v,\, a)$ subject to the defining relations. Firstly, in §2 we define elements $X(e_i,\, v,\, a)$, i.e., consider a special case, where $u = e_i$ is a base vector. In fact, any element from a unipotent radical of type U_1 in $\mathrm{Ep}(2l,\, R)$ has the form $T(e_i,\, v,\, a)$. Further, the corresponding unipotent radicals of the Steinberg group and of the elementary group are isomorphic (Lemma 6). This specifies the choice of $X(e_i,\, v,\, a)$. After that we verify the desired properties of $X(e_i,\, v,\, a)$ such as those stated in Lemmas 1 and 2, see Lemmas 9, 10, 11, 12.

In §3 we generalise the definition of $X(u,\, v,\, a)$ to a wider class of u. Namely, we require that $u_i = u_{-i} = 0$. First, observe that the property stated in Lemma 2,

$$[X(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, X(e_{-i},\, v,\, a)] = X(u,\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)X(e_{-i},\, -ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0),$$

follows from the desired relations on our ESD-generators P1–P3 (see Lemma 41). In this formula, only $X(u,\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)$ is not yet defined. Thus, we can specify the choice of $X(u,\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a) \in \phi^{-1}T(u,\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)$ by this formula. It can be done only in situation when $u_i = v_i = u_{-i} = v_{-i} = 0$ (the condition of Lemma 2). Obviously, we have to check that this definition is correct (Lemma 16). We also generalise this definition to the case of an arbitrary v (where correctness is provided by Lemma 20).

In §4 we pass to an arbitrary u. Since $X(u,\, 0,\, a)$ generate the Steinberg group (Lemma 30), we can assume that $v = 0$. We use the analogue of the relation

$$T(v + w,\, 0,\, a) = T(v,\, 0,\, a)T(w,\, 0,\, a)T(w,\, va,\, 0)$$

to define ESD-generators of the Steinberg group. Take $w = e_i u_i + e_{-i} u_{-i}$ and $v = u - w$. Then the left hand side of the above equation is equal to $T(u, 0, a)$, and all ESD-transformations at the right hand side are already lifted to the Steinberg group in §3. Section §4 is devoted to the proof of correctness (Lemma 25) and some auxiliary results.

After defining Steinberg long-root unipotents $X(u, 0, a)$, in §5 we prove the conjugation property

$$g\, X(u, 0, a) g^{-1} = X(\phi(g)u, 0, a).$$

It suffices to consider only the cases $g = X_{i,-i}(b)$ (Lemma 26) and $g = X_{jk}(b)$ (Lemma 29). At this point the Main Theorem immediately follows.

The objective of §6 is to prove relations P1–P6. We start with P5 (Lemma 33). Then we define short-root unipotents $X(v, u, 0)$ by the relation

$$X(u + v, 0, 1) = X(u, 0, 1) X(v, 0, 1) X(v, u, 0).$$

After that, we obtain P4 (Lemma 34) and P6 (Lemma 37). Next, we define $X(u, v, a) = X(u, v, 0) X(u, 0, a)$ and check P1–P3 (Lemma 40).

Finally, in §7 we define a symplectic van der Kallen group $\mathrm{StSp}^*(2l, R)$ by relations P1–P3 and show that it is actually isomorphic to the usual symplectic Steinberg group.

2 Unipotent radicals in Steinberg groups

Our first goal is to define analogues of ESD-transvections $T(u, v, a)$ in the Steinberg group for the special case when u is a base vector.

Definition. Define the (*Steinberg*) *unipotent radical*

$$^{(i)}U_1 = \langle X_{ij}(a) \mid j \neq i,\ a \in R \rangle$$

and the (*Steinberg*) *parabolic subgroup*

$$^{(i)}P_1 = \langle X_{kh}(a) \mid \{h, -k\} \not\ni i,\ a \in R \rangle.$$

The next result is well-known. It easily follows from the Steinberg relations.

Lemma 4 (Levi decomposition)**.** *For $g \in {}^{(i)}P_1$, $u \in {}^{(i)}U_1$ one has*

$$gug^{-1} \in {}^{(i)}U_1.$$

The next lemma is another obvious consequence of the Steinberg relations.

Lemma 5. *One has*

$$[{}^{(i)}U_1,\ {}^{(i)}U_1] \le \langle X_{i,-i}(a)\rangle, \qquad [{}^{(i)}U_1,\ \langle X_{i,-i}(a)\rangle] = 1.$$

In other words, this lemma asserts that the root subgroup $X_{i,-i}$ lies in the centre of ${}^{(i)}U_1$, and that the nilpotent class of ${}^{(i)}U_1$ is ≤ 2. Now it is easy to see the following corollary.

Corollary. *Every element of ${}^{(i)}U_1$ can be expressed in the form*

$$X_{i,-l}(a_{-l})\dots X_{i,-1}(a_{-1})X_{i,1}(a_1)\dots X_{i,l}(a_l).$$

Clearly, we mean that the nonexistent factor $X_{ii}(a_i)$ is omitted in this product.

Lemma 6. *The restriction of the natural projection ϕ: $\mathrm{StSp}(2l,\ R) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Ep}(2l,\ R)$ to ${}^{(i)}U_1$ is injective*

$${}^{(i)}U_1 \cong \phi({}^{(i)}U_1).$$

Proof. Take an element $x \in {}^{(i)}U_1$. Using the above corollary, decompose x as

$$x = X_{i,-l}(a_{-l})\dots X_{i,-1}(a_{-1})X_{i,1}(a_1)\dots X_{i,l}(a_l).$$

Then $\phi(x) = 1$ implies that $a_i = 0$ for all i. □

Lemma 7. *For $v \in V$ such that $v_{-i} = 0$ denote*

$$v_- = \sum_{i<0} e_i v_i \qquad \textit{and} \qquad v_+ = \sum_{i>0} e_i v_i.$$

Then

$$T(e_i,\ v,\ a) = T_{i,-i}(a + 2v_i - v_i\varepsilon_i - \langle v_-,\ v_+\rangle)\cdot \\ \cdot T_{-l,-i}(v_{-l}\varepsilon_i)\dots T_{-1,-i}(v_{-1}\varepsilon_i)T_{1,-i}(v_1\varepsilon_i)\dots T_{l,-i}(v_l\varepsilon_i).$$

Proof. Assume that $i > 0$, for $i < 0$ the proof looks exactly the same. Since $T_{j,-i}(v_j\varepsilon_i) = T(e_i,\ e_j v_j,\ 0)$ for $j \ne -i$ and

$$T_{i,-i}(2v_i) = T(e_i,\ 0,\ 2v_i) = T(e_i,\ e_i v_i,\ 0),$$

one has

$$T_{-l,-i}(v_{-l}\varepsilon_i)\dots T_{-1,-i}(v_{-1}\varepsilon_i) = \\ = T(e_i,\, e_{-l}v_{-l},\, 0)\dots T(e_i,\, e_{-1}v_{-1},\, 0) = T(e_i,\, v_-,\, 0),$$

and

$$T_{i,-i}(2v_i)T_{i,-i}(-v_i\varepsilon_i)T_{1,-i}(v_1\varepsilon_i)\dots T_{l,-i}(v_l\varepsilon_i) = \\ = T(e_i,\, e_1v_1,\, 0)\dots T(e_i,\, e_lv_l,\, 0) = T(e_i,\, v_+,\, 0).$$

Here factors $T_{i,-i}(-v_i\varepsilon_i)$ and $T_{i,-i}(v_i\varepsilon_i)$ just cancel each other. So that the right hand side of the desired equality is in fact equal to

$$T_{i,-i}(a - \langle v_-,\, v_+\rangle)T(e_i,\, v_-,\, 0)T(e_i,\, v_+,\, 0) = \\ = T(e_i,\, 0,\, a - \langle v_-,\, v_+\rangle)T(e_i, v, \langle v_-,\, v_+\rangle) = T(e_i,\, v,\, a).$$

□

Definition. For $v \in V$ with $v_{-i} = 0$, $a \in R$, define

$$Y(e_i,\, v,\, a) = (\phi|_{(i)U_1})^{-1}\big(T(e_i,\, v,\, a)\big).$$

Remark. By Lemma 7, $T(e_i,\, v,\, a)$ indeed lies in $\phi({}^{(i)}U_1)$. Moreover, the same lemma provides the following decomposition.

Lemma 8. *For $v \in V$ such that $v_{-i} = 0$, $a \in R$, one has*

$$Y(e_i,\, v,\, a) = X_{i,-i}(a + 2v_i - v_i\varepsilon_i - \langle v_-,\, v_+\rangle)\cdot \\ \cdot X_{-l,-i}(v_{-l}\varepsilon_i)\dots X_{-1,-i}(v_{-1}\varepsilon_i)X_{1,-i}(v_1\varepsilon_i)\dots X_{l,-i}(v_l\varepsilon_i).$$

Corollary 1. *In particular, $Y(e_{-j},\, -e_ia\varepsilon_j,\, 0) = X_{ij}(a)$ for $i \notin \{\pm j\}$ and $Y(e_i,\, 0,\, a) = X_{i,-i}(a)$.*

Corollary 2. *For $j \neq -i$, $v \in V$ such that $v_{-i} = v_{-j} = 0$, $a \in R$, one has $Y(e_i,\, v,\, a) \in {}^{(j)}P_1$.*

Lemma 9. *For $v,\, w \in V$ such that $v_{-i} = w_{-i} = 0$ and $a,\, b \in R$, one has*

$$Y(e_i,\, v,\, a)Y(e_i,\, w,\, b) = Y(e_i,\, v + w,\, a + b + \langle v,\, w\rangle).$$

Proof. Obviously, $(v + w)_{-i} = 0$, so that the right hand side of this equality is well-defined. Now, it remains to observe that the images of the elements on both sides under ϕ coincide. □

Corollary. *One has* $Y(e_i,\, 0,\, 0) = 1$ *and* $Y(e_i,\, v,\, a)^{-1} = Y(e_i,\, -v,\, -a)$.

Lemma 10. *For* $g \in {}^{(i)}P_1$, $v \in V$ *such that* $v_{-i} = 0$, $a \in R$, *one has*

$$g\, Y(e_i,\, v,\, a) g^{-1} = Y(e_i,\, \phi(g)v,\, a).$$

Proof. First, observe that since $T_{kh}(a)e_i = e_i$ for $i \notin \{h, -k\}$ one has $\phi(g)e_i = e_i$. Thus,

$$\langle e_i,\, \phi(g)v\rangle = \langle \phi(g)e_i,\, \phi(g)v\rangle = \langle e_i,\, v\rangle = 0.$$

It follows that $(\phi(g)v)_{-i} = 0$ and the right hand side of the desired equation is well-defined. Finally, observe that the images of both sides under ϕ coincide. □

Lemma 11. *For* $j \neq -i$, $a \in R$, *one has* $Y(e_i,\, e_j a,\, 0) = Y(e_j,\, e_i a,\, 0)$.

Proof. For $i = j$ the claim is obvious. Let $i \neq j$, then

$$Y(e_i,\, e_j a,\, 0) = X_{-j,i}(a\varepsilon_i) = X_{-i,j}(-a\varepsilon_j) = Y(e_j,\, e_i a,\, 0),$$

where the second equality is by R0. □

The next lemma is an analogue of Lemma 2 for $Y(e_i,\, v,\, a)$'s.

Lemma 12. *For* $v \in V$ *such that* $v_{-j} = v_k = v_{-k} = 0$, $k \notin \{\pm j\}$, a, $b \in R$, *one has*

$$[Y(e_k,\, e_j b,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-k},\, v,\, a)] = Y(e_j,\, vb\varepsilon_k,\, ab^2) Y(e_{-k},\, -e_j ab\varepsilon_{-k},\, 0).$$

Proof. Since $Y(e_k,\, e_j b,\, 0)$ lies in ${}^{(j)}U_1$ and $Y(e_{-k},\, v,\, a)$ lies in ${}^{(j)}P_1$, both sides of the claimed equality lie in ${}^{(j)}U_1$. Now it remains to use that their images in $\mathrm{Ep}(2l,\, R)$ coincide by Lemma 2. □

Corollary. *For* $v \in V$ *such that* $v_{-j} = v_k = v_{-k} = 0$, $k \notin \{\pm j\}$, a, $b \in R$, *one has the following decomposition*

$$Y(e_j,\, vb,\, ab^2) = [Y(e_k,\, e_j b,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-k},\, v\varepsilon_k,\, a)] Y(e_{-k},\, e_j ab\varepsilon_{-k},\, 0).$$

Definition. For $i \notin \{\pm j\}$, $\alpha \in R^\times$ define

$$W_{ij}(\alpha) = X_{ij}(\alpha) X_{ji}(-\alpha^{-1}) X_{ij}(\alpha).$$

The following fact is well-known. One can prove it either using the Steinberg relations, or applying conjugation formulae obtained above.

Lemma 13. *For $i \notin \{\pm j\}$, $k \notin \{\pm i, \pm j\}$, $\alpha \in R^\times$, $a \in R$, one has*

a) ${}^{W_{ij}(\alpha)}X_{kj}(a) = X_{ki}(\alpha^{-1}a)$,

b) ${}^{W_{ij}(\alpha)}X_{k,-j}(a) = X_{k,-i}(\alpha a \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j)$,

c) ${}^{W_{ij}(\alpha)}X_{j,-j}(a) = X_{i,-i}(\alpha^2 a)$,

d) ${}^{W_{ij}(\alpha)}X_{-j,j}(a) = X_{-i,i}(\alpha^{-2}a)$.

Lemma 14. *Consider $v \in V$ such that $v_i = v_{-i} = v_j = v_{-j} = 0$, $i \notin \{\pm j\}$, $\alpha \in R^\times$. Then*

a) ${}^{W_{ij}(\alpha)}Y(e_j,\, v,\, a) = Y(e_i,\, v\alpha,\, \alpha^2 a)$,

b) ${}^{W_{ij}(\alpha)}Y(e_{-j},\, v,\, a) = Y(e_{-i},\, v\alpha^{-1}\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_j,\, \alpha^{-2}a)$.

Proof. By Lemma 8 one has

$$\begin{aligned} Y(e_j,\, v,\, a) = X_{j,-j}(a - \langle v_-,\, v_+\rangle)\cdot \\ \cdot X_{-l,-j}(v_{-l}\varepsilon_j)\dots X_{-1,-j}(v_{-1}\varepsilon_j)X_{1,-j}(v_1\varepsilon_j)\dots X_{l,-j}(v_l\varepsilon_j). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the elements of the form $X_{-i,-j}(v_{-i}\varepsilon_j)$ and $X_{i,-j}(v_i\varepsilon_j)$ may be omitted in this product since $v_i = v_{-i} = 0$. Thus, by the previous lemma we have

$$\begin{aligned} &{}^{W_{ij}(\alpha)}Y(e_j,\, v,\, a) = \\ &= {}^{W_{ij}(\alpha)}X_{j,-j}(a - \langle v_-,\, v_+\rangle)\cdot \\ &\cdot {}^{W_{ij}(\alpha)}\big(X_{-l,-j}(v_{-l}\varepsilon_j)\dots X_{-1,-j}(v_{-1}\varepsilon_j)X_{1,-j}(v_1\varepsilon_j)\dots X_{l,-j}(v_l\varepsilon_j)\big) = \\ &= X_{i,-i}((a - \langle v_-,\, v_+\rangle)\alpha^2)\cdot \\ &\cdot X_{-l,-i}(v_{-l}\alpha\varepsilon_i)\dots X_{-1,-i}(v_{-1}\alpha\varepsilon_i)X_{1,-i}(v_1\alpha\varepsilon_i)\dots X_{l,-i}(v_l\alpha\varepsilon_i) = \\ &= Y(e_i,\, v\alpha,\, \alpha^2 a). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can prove *b*). □

3 Definition of ESD-generators for vectors having zeros

In the preceding section we have in particular proven the decomposition of the type stated in Lemma 2 for the Steinberg ESD-generators $X(u,\, v,\, a)$, in the special case where $u = e_i$. Now, we intend to use this decomposition

to define the ESD-generators in larger generality, where u is not necessarily equal to a base vector, but has at least one pair of zero coordinates. As always, the main technical issue is to verify the correctness of such a definition.

In the sequel we assume that if the converse is not specified explicitly, then indexes denoted by different letters are neither equal, nor have a zero sum, e.g., $i \notin \{\pm j\}$.

Definition. For $u,\, v \in V$ such that $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, $u_i = u_{-i} = v_i = v_{-i} = 0$, $a \in R$ denote

$$Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a) = [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)]Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0).$$

Remark. Due to Lemma 2 one has $\phi\big(Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a)\big) = T(u,\, v,\, a)$.

Remark. For $v \in V$ with $v_{-j} = v_i = v_{-i} = 0$, $a \in R$ one has

$$Y_{(i)}(e_j,\, v,\, a) = Y(e_j,\, v,\, a)$$

by Lemma 12. Similarly, one can obtain the following result.

Lemma 15. *For $v \in V$ with $v_{-j} = v_i = v_{-i} = 0$, $b \in R$ one has*

$$Y_{(i)}(v,\, e_j b,\, 0) = Y(e_j,\, vb,\, 0).$$

Proof. Since $Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0) \in {}^{(j)}P_1$, both sides lie in ${}^{(j)}U_1$. □

Lemma 16. *Consider $u,\, v \in V$ such that $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, $u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0$ and $v_i = v_{-i} = v_j = v_{-j} = 0$, and $a \in R$. Then one has*

$$Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a) = Y_{(j)}(u,\, v,\, a).$$

Proof. Firstly, observe that since $u_i = u_{-i} = v_i = v_{-i} = 0$, one has

$$Y(e_j,\, u,\, 0),\ Y(e_{-j},\, v\varepsilon_j,\, a),\ Y(e_{-j},\, ua\varepsilon_{-j},\, 0) \in {}^{(i)}P_1 \cap {}^{(-i)}P_1.$$

Thus, $Y_{(j)}(u,\, v,\, a)$ also belongs to ${}^{(i)}P_1 \cap {}^{(-i)}P_1$. Then,

$${}^{Y_{(j)}(u,\, v,\, a)}X_{ij}(1) = {}^{Y_{(j)}(u,\, v,\, a)}Y(e_i,\, e_{-j}\varepsilon_{-j},\, 0) = Y(e_i,\, e_{-j}\varepsilon_{-j},\, 0) = X_{ij}(1),$$

or, what is the same, $[Y_{(j)}(u,\, v,\, a),\, X_{ij}(1)] = 1$. Similarly, one can check that $[Y_{(j)}(u,\, v,\, a),\, X_{ji}(-1)] = 1$. Thus, $Y_{(j)}(u,\, v,\, a)$ commutes with $W_{ij}(1)$ and using Lemma 14 one gets

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{(j)}(u,\, v,\, a) &= {}^{W_{ij}(1)}Y_{(j)}(u,\, v,\, a) = \\ &= {}^{W_{ij}(1)}\big([Y(e_j,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-j},\, v\varepsilon_j,\, a)]Y(e_{-j},\, ua\varepsilon_{-j},\, 0)\big) = \\ &= [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)]Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) = Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark. For u and v having only one pair of zero coordinates we have not yet proven that $Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a) = Y_{(-i)}(u,\, v,\, a)$. This is why for the time being we have to keep the index in the notation for our ESD-generators.

Definition. Define the (*Steinberg*) *Levi subgroup* ${}^{(i)}L_1 = {}^{(i)}P_1 \cap {}^{(-i)}P_1$.

Remark. Observe that for $g \in {}^{(i)}L_1$ one has $\phi(g)e_i = e_i$ and $\phi(g)e_{-i} = e_{-i}$. Indeed, take $h \neq k$, then the first equality holds for $g = X_{kh}(a)$ with $\{-k, h\} \not\ni i$ and the second one for $g = X_{kh}(a)$ with $\{-k, h\} \not\ni -i$.

Lemma 17. *For $u,\, v \in V$ such that $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, $u_i = u_{-i} = v_i = v_{-i} = 0$, $a \in R$, $g \in {}^{(i)}L_1$, one has*

$$g\, Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a)g^{-1} = Y_{(i)}(\phi(g)u,\, \phi(g)v,\, a).$$

Remark. Since $\langle \phi(g)u,\, e_i\rangle = \langle \phi(g)u,\, \phi(g)e_i\rangle = \langle u,\, e_i\rangle = 0$, one can see that $(\phi(g)u)_{-i} = 0$ and similarly $(\phi(g)u)_i = (\phi(g)v)_{-i} = (\phi(g)v)_i = 0$. Thus, $Y_{(i)}(\phi(g)u,\, \phi(g)v,\, a)$ is well-defined.

Proof. Using $g \in {}^{(i)}P_1 \cap {}^{(-i)}P_1$ and Lemma 10 one gets

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{g}Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a) &= {}^{g}\big([Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)]Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0)\big) = \\ &= [Y(e_i,\, \phi(g)u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, \phi(g)v\varepsilon_i,\, a)]Y(e_{-i},\, \phi(g)ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) = \\ &= Y_{(i)}(\phi(g)u,\, \phi(g)v,\, a). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark. Lemma 7 implies that for v such that $v_{-i} = v_j = v_{-j} = 0$, one has $Y(e_i,\, v,\, a) \in {}^{(j)}L_1$.

Remark. For w orthogonal to both u and v, $\langle u,\, w\rangle = \langle v,\, w\rangle = 0$, one has $T(u,\, v,\, a)w = w$. Below, in the computations this fact is frequently used without any special reference.

Lemma 18. *For $u,\, v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0$, $v_i = v_{-i} = 0$ and $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, and for $a,\, b \in R$, one has*

$$Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a)Y_{(i)}(u,\, e_jb,\, 0) = Y_{(i)}(u,\, v + e_jb,\, a + v_{-j}b\varepsilon_{-j}).$$

Proof. Start with the right-hand side

$$\begin{aligned} &Y_{(i)}(u,\, v + e_jb,\, a + v_{-j}b\varepsilon_{-j}) = \\ &= [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, (v+e_jb)\varepsilon_i,\, a+v_{-j}b\varepsilon_{-j})]Y(e_{-i},\, u(a+v_{-j}b\varepsilon_{-j})\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Decompose $Y(e_{-i},\, (v+e_jb)\varepsilon_i,\, a+v_{-j}b\varepsilon_{-j})$ inside the commutator and use the familiar identity $[a,\, bc] = [a,\, b]\cdot {}^b[a,\, c]$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}[Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, (v+e_jb)\varepsilon_i,\, a+v_{-j}b\varepsilon_{-j})] = \\ = [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)Y(e_{-i},\, e_jb\varepsilon_i,\, 0)] = \\ = [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)]\cdot {}^{Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)}Y(e_j,\, ub,\, 0).\end{aligned}$$

Observe that in general $Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)$ does not lie in ${}^{(j)}P_1$, but $Y(e_j,\, ub,\, 0)$ always lies in ${}^{(-i)}P_1$. So that we can compute the conjugate as follows

$$\begin{aligned}{}^{Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)}Y(e_j,\, ub,\, 0) = \\ = Y(e_j,\, ub,\, 0)[Y(e_j,\, -ub,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)] = \\ = Y(e_j,\, ub,\, 0)Y(e_{-i},\, -ubv_{-j}\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_j,\, 0).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}Y_{(i)}(u,\, v+e_jb,\, a+v_{-j}b\varepsilon_{-j}) = \\ = [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)]Y(e_j,\, ub,\, 0)Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, it remains to observe that $Y(e_j,\, ub,\, 0) \in {}^{(-i)}P_1$ commutes with $Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0)$ and

$$Y_{(i)}(u,\, v+e_jb,\, a+v_{-j}b\varepsilon_j) = Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a)Y_{(i)}(u,\, e_jb,\, 0).$$

□

We have defined $Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a)$ only for u and v both having pairs of zeros. Now we want to define the generators for an arbitrary v.

Definition. For $u,\, v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = 0$, $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, and $a \in R$ define

$$\begin{aligned}Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a) = \\ = Y_{(i)}(u, v-e_iv_i-e_{-i}v_{-i}, a-v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i)Y(e_i,\, uv_i,\, 0)Y(e_{-i},\, uv_{-i},\, 0).\end{aligned}$$

Remark. Observe that the above definition coincides with the old one for v with $v_i = v_{-i} = 0$, so that we can use the same notation for the generator. Observe also that the right-hand side is well-defined. Namely, $v - e_iv_i - e_{-i}v_{-i}$ has zeros in positions $\pm i$ and is orthogonal to u. Indeed, it is obvious since v, e_i and e_{-i} are orthogonal to u.

Lemma 19. *For $g \in {}^{(i)}L_1$, $u,\ v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = 0$, $\langle u,\ v\rangle = 0$, and $a \in R$ one has*

$$g\, Y_{(i)}(u,\ v,\ a)g^{-1} = Y_{(i)}(\phi(g)u,\ \phi(g)v,\ a).$$

Proof. Since $g \in {}^{(i)}L_1$ one gets

$$\big(\phi(g)v\big)_i = \langle \phi(g)v,\ e_{-i}\rangle\varepsilon_i = \langle \phi(g)v,\ \phi(g)e_{-i}\rangle\varepsilon_i = \langle v,\ e_{-i}\rangle\varepsilon_i = v_i$$

and similarly $\big(\phi(g)v\big)_{-i} = v_{-i}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&{}^gY_{(i)}(u,\ v,\ a) = \\
&= {}^gY_{(i)}(u, v - e_iv_i - e_{-i}v_{-i}, a - v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i)\cdot {}^gY(e_i,\ uv_i,\ 0)\cdot {}^gY(e_{-i},\ uv_{-i},\ 0) = \\
&= Y_{(i)}(\phi(g)u, \phi(g)v - e_i\big(\phi(g)v\big)_i - e_{-i}\big(\phi(g)v\big)_{-i}, a - \big(\phi(g)v\big)_i\big(\phi(g)v\big)_{-i}\varepsilon_i)\cdot \\
&\qquad \cdot Y(e_i,\ \phi(g)u\big(\phi(g)v\big)_i,\ 0)Y(e_{-i},\ \phi(g)u\big(\phi(g)v\big)_{-i},\ 0) = \\
&\qquad\qquad = Y_{(i)}(\phi(g)u,\ \phi(g)v,\ a).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark. Obviously, for $u,\ v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0$ and $v_j = v_{-j} = 0$, $a \in R$, one has $Y_{(i)}(u,\ v,\ a) \in {}^{(j)}L_1$. Indeed, it is a product of elements from ${}^{(j)}L_1$ by definition.

Lemma 20. *For $u,\ v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0$, $\langle u,\ v\rangle = 0$, and $a \in R$ one has*

$$Y_{(i)}(u,\ v,\ a) = Y_{(j)}(u,\ v,\ a).$$

Proof. Denote $\tilde{v} = v - e_iv_i - e_{-i}v_{-i}$, $\tilde{a} = a - v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i$. Then by Lemma 18 one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
&Y_{(i)}(u,\ \tilde{v},\ \tilde{a}) = Y_{(i)}(u,\ \tilde{v} - e_{-j}v_{-j},\ \tilde{a} - v_jv_{-j}\varepsilon_j)Y_{(i)}(u,\ e_{-j}v_{-j},\ 0) = \\
&= Y_{(i)}(u,\ \tilde{v} - e_{-j}v_{-j} - e_jv_j,\ \tilde{a} - v_jv_{-j}\varepsilon_j)Y_{(i)}(u,\ e_jv_j,\ 0)Y_{(i)}(u,\ e_{-j}v_{-j},\ 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Further, denote $\tilde{\tilde{v}} = \tilde{v} - e_jv_j - e_{-j}v_{-j}$ and $\tilde{\tilde{a}} = \tilde{a} - v_jv_{-j}\varepsilon_j$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{(i)}(u,\ v,\ a) = Y_{(i)}(u,\ \tilde{\tilde{v}},\ \tilde{\tilde{a}})Y(e_j,\ uv_j,\ 0)Y(e_{-j},\ uv_{-j},\ 0)\cdot \\
\cdot Y(e_i,\ uv_i,\ 0)Y(e_{-i},\ uv_{-i},\ 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Changing roles of i and j one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{(j)}(u,\ v,\ a) = Y_{(j)}(u,\ \tilde{\tilde{v}},\ \tilde{\tilde{a}})Y(e_i,\ uv_i,\ 0)Y(e_{-i},\ uv_{-i},\ 0)\cdot \\
\cdot Y(e_j,\ uv_j,\ 0)Y(e_{-j},\ uv_{-j},\ 0).
\end{aligned}$$

But $Y_{(i)}(u,\, \tilde{v},\, \tilde{a}) = Y_{(j)}(u,\, \tilde{v},\, \tilde{a})$ by Lemma 16. Finally, it remains to observe that $Y(e_{-i},\, uv_{-i},\, 0)$ and $Y(e_i,\, uv_i,\, 0)$ commute with both $Y(e_j,\, uv_j,\, 0)$ and $Y(e_{-j},\, uv_{-j},\, 0)$. This is obvious from the fact that the above elements lie in ${}^{(j)}L_1$. □

Remark. For u equal to the base vector e_j using Lemma 12 one gets

$$\begin{aligned} &Y_{(i)}(e_j,\, v,\, a) = \\ &\quad = Y(e_j, v - e_i v_i - e_{-i} v_{-i}, a - v_i v_{-i} \varepsilon_i) Y(e_i,\, e_j v_i,\, 0) Y(e_{-i},\, e_j v_{-i},\, 0) = \\ &\qquad\qquad = Y(e_j,\, v,\, a). \end{aligned}$$

Definition. For u having at least two pairs of zeros the element $Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a)$ does not depend on the choice of i by Lemma 20. In this situation we will often omit the index in the notation,

$$Y(u,\, v,\, a) = Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a).$$

4 Long root type elements

Definition. For $u \in V$ and $a \in R$ define

$$\begin{aligned} X_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, a) = Y_{(i)}(u - e_i u_i - e_{-i} u_{-i},\, 0,\, a) Y(e_i u_i + e_{-i} u_{-i},\, 0,\, a) \cdot \\ \cdot Y(e_i u_i + e_{-i} u_{-i},\, (u - e_i u_i - e_{-i} u_{-i}) a,\, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Our objective in this section is to show that $X_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, a)$ does not depend on the choice of i.

Lemma 21. *For $u,\, v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0$, $v_i = v_{-i} = 0$, $\langle u,\, v \rangle = 0$, $a,\, b \in R$ one has*

$$Y(u,\, v,\, a + b) = Y(u,\, v,\, a) Y(u,\, 0,\, b).$$

Proof. Decompose $Y(u,\, v,\, a + b)$ as a product of unipotents

$$Y(u,\, v,\, a + b) = [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a + b)] Y(e_{-i},\, u(a + b)\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0).$$

Using $[a,\, bc] = [a,\, b] \cdot {}^{b}[a,\, c]$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &[Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a + b)] = \\ &\quad = [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)] \cdot {}^{Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)}[Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, 0,\, b)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$ one has

$$^{Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)}Y(e_{-i},\, ub\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) = Y(e_{-i},\, ub\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&Y(u,\, v,\, a+b) = \\
&\quad = [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a+b)]Y(e_{-i},\, ub\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0)Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) = \\
&\quad = [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)] \cdot {}^{Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)}[Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, 0,\, b)] \cdot \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot {}^{Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)}Y(e_{-i},\, ub\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) \cdot Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) = \\
&= [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, 0)] \cdot {}^{Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)}Y_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, b) \cdot Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $Y_{(j)}(u,\, 0,\, b) \in {}^{(i)}L_1$ commutes with both $Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, 0)$ and $Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(u,\, v,\, a+b) = [Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)]Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0)Y(u,\, 0,\, b) = \\
= Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a)Y(u,\, 0,\, b).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark. For $u \in V$ having at least two pairs of zeros one has $Y(u,\, 0,\, 0) = 1$ and $Y(u,\, 0,\, a)^{-1} = Y(u,\, 0,\, -a)$.

Lemma 22. *For $u,\, v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0$, $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, and $a \in R$ one has*

$$Y(u,\, v,\, a) = Y(u,\, v - e_iv_i - e_{-i}v_{-i},\, a)Y(u,\, e_iv_i + e_{-i}v_{-i},\, 0).$$

Proof. By definition

$$\begin{aligned}
&Y(u,\, v,\, a) = Y_{(i)}(u,\, v,\, a) = \\
&\quad = Y_{(i)}(u, v - e_iv_i - e_{-i}v_{-i}, a - v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i)Y(e_i,\, uv_i,\, 0)Y(e_{-i},\, uv_{-i},\, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $\tilde{v} = v - e_iv_i - e_{-i}v_{-i}$, then by the previous lemma

$$Y(u, \tilde{v}, a - v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i) = Y(u,\, \tilde{v},\, a)Y(u,\, 0,\, -v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(u,\, v,\, a) = Y(u,\, \tilde{v},\, a)Y(u,\, 0,\, -v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i)Y(e_i,\, uv_i,\, 0)Y(e_{-i},\, uv_{-i},\, 0) = \\
= Y(u,\, \tilde{v},\, a)Y_{(i)}(u,\, e_iv_i + e_{-i}v_{-i},\, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary. *Consider $u \in V$, $a \in R$, and denote $v = e_i u_i + e_{-i} u_{-i}$, $v' = e_j u_j + e_{-j} u_{-j}$, $\tilde{u} = u - v$, $\tilde{\tilde{u}} = \tilde{u} - v'$. Then one has*

$$X_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, a) = Y_{(i)}(\tilde{u},\, 0,\, a) Y(v,\, 0,\, a) Y(v,\, \tilde{u}a,\, 0) = \\ = Y_{(i)}(\tilde{u},\, 0,\, a) Y(v,\, 0,\, a) Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0) Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0).$$

Proof. Since $l \geq 3$ the vector v has at least two pairs of zeros, so that one can apply the previous lemma. □

Lemma 23. *Consider $j,\, k \notin \{\pm i\}$ but not necessarily distinct or having non-zero sum, $u,\, v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0$ and $v_i = v_{-i} = v_k = v_{-k} = 0$, $\langle u,\, v \rangle = 0$, and $a \in R$. Then holds*

$$Y_{(i)}(u + v,\, 0,\, a) = Y(u,\, 0,\, a) Y(v,\, 0,\, a) Y(v,\, ua,\, 0).$$

Proof. Decomposing $Y(e_i,\, u+v,\, 0) = Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0) Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0)$ inside the commutator and using $[ab,\, c] = {}^a[b,\, c] \cdot [a,\, c]$ we get

$$Y_{(i)}(u + v,\, 0,\, a) = [Y(e_i,\, u + v,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, 0,\, a)] Y(e_{-i},\, (u+v)a\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) = \\ = {}^{Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)}[Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, 0,\, a)] \cdot [Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, 0,\, a)] \cdot \\ \cdot Y(e_{-i},\, va\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) = {}^{Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)}[Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, 0,\, a)] \cdot \\ \cdot Y_{(i)}(v,\, 0,\, a) Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0).$$

Observing that $Y_{(k)}(v,\, 0,\, a) \in {}^{(i)}L_1$ commutes with both $Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)$ and $Y(e_{-i},\, -ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0)$, we get

$${}^{Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)}[Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, 0,\, a)] \cdot Y(v,\, 0,\, a) \cdot Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) = \\ = {}^{Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)}[Y(e_i,\, u,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, 0,\, a)] \cdot {}^{Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)}Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) \cdot \\ \cdot {}^{Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)}Y(e_{-i},\, -ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) \cdot Y(v,\, 0,\, a) \cdot Y(e_{-i},\, ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0) = \\ = {}^{Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)}Y_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, a) \cdot Y(v,\, 0,\, a) \cdot [Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, -ua\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0)] = \\ = {}^{Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)}Y(u,\, 0,\, a) \cdot Y(v,\, 0,\, a) \cdot Y(v,\, ua,\, 0).$$

Finally, use that $Y_{(j)}(u,\, 0,\, a) \in {}^{(i)}L_1$ commutes with $Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0)$. □

Corollary. *Consider $u \in V$, $a \in R$, and denote $v = e_i u_i + e_{-i} u_{-i}$, $v' = e_j u_j + e_{-j} u_{-j}$, $\tilde{u} = u - v$, $\tilde{\tilde{u}} = \tilde{u} - v'$. Then*

$$X_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, a) = Y_{(i)}(\tilde{u},\, 0,\, a) Y(v,\, 0,\, a) Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0) Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0) = \\ = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, 0,\, a) Y(v',\, 0,\, a) Y(v',\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0) Y(v,\, 0,\, a) Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0) Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0).$$

Lemma 24. *For $j,\ k \notin \{\pm i\}$ but not necessarily distinct or having non-zero sum, $u,\ v \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0$ and $v_i = v_{-i} = v_k = v_{-k} = 0$, $\langle u,\ v\rangle = 0$, and $a \in R$, one has*

$$Y(u,\ va,\ 0) = Y(v,\ ua,\ 0).$$

Proof. By Lemma 23 one has

$$Y(v,\ ua,\ 0) = Y(v,\ 0,\ -a)Y(u,\ 0,\ -a)Y_{(i)}(u+v,\ 0,\ a)$$

and similarly

$$Y(u,\ va,\ 0) = Y(u,\ 0,\ -a)Y(v,\ 0,\ -a)Y_{(i)}(v+u,\ 0,\ a).$$

But $Y_{(i)}(u,\ 0,\ -a) \in {}^{(i)}L_1$ commutes with $Y_{(i)}(v,\ 0,\ -a)$. □

Lemma 25. *For $u \in V$ and $a \in R$ one has*

$$X_{(i)}(u,\ 0,\ a) = X_{(j)}(u,\ 0,\ a).$$

Proof. Set

$$v = e_i u_i + e_{-i}u_{-i}, \quad v' = e_j u_j + e_{-j}u_{-j}, \quad \tilde{u} = u - v, \quad \tilde{\tilde{u}} = \tilde{u} - v'.$$

As we have already noticed, Lemmas 22 and 23 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &X_{(i)}(u,\ 0,\ a) = Y_{(i)}(\tilde{u},\ 0,\ a)Y(v,\ 0,\ a)Y(v,\ \tilde{u}a,\ 0) = \\ &\quad = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\ 0,\ a)Y(v',\ 0,\ a)Y(v',\ \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\ 0)Y(v,\ 0,\ a)Y(v,\ \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\ 0)Y(v,\ v'a,\ 0). \end{aligned}$$

Interchanging roles of i and j one has

$$\begin{aligned} &X_{(j)}(u,\ 0,\ a) = \\ &\quad = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\ 0,\ a)Y(v,\ 0,\ a)Y(v,\ \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\ 0)Y(v',\ 0,\ a)Y(v',\ \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\ 0)Y(v',\ va,\ 0). \end{aligned}$$

One has $Y(v,\ v'a,\ 0) = Y(v',\ va,\ 0)$ by Lemma 24. Now we have to show that $Y(v,\ 0,\ a)Y(v,\ \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\ 0)$ commutes with $Y(v',\ 0,\ a)Y(v',\ \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\ 0)$. With this end fix $k \notin \{\pm i, \pm j\}$. Observe that $Y_{(i)}(v',\ 0,\ a) \in {}^{(k)}L_1$ commutes with $Y_{(k)}(v,\ \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\ 0)$ by Lemma 19. Next, by Lemma 24 one has

$$Y(v,\ \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\ 0) = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\ va,\ 0)$$

and

$$Y(v',\ \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\ 0) = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\ v'a,\ 0).$$

Now, Lemma 22 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v',\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0) &= Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, va,\, 0)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, v'a,\, 0) = \\ &= Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, va + v'a,\, 0) = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, v'a,\, 0)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, va,\, 0) = \\ &= Y(v',\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, it remains to observe that $Y_{(j)}(v,\, 0,\, a) \in {}^{(k)}L_1$ commutes with both $Y_{(k)}(v',\, 0,\, a)$ and $Y_{(k)}(v',\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)$ by Lemma 19. □

Remark. Since $X_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, a)$ does not depend on the choice of i we will often omit the index in the notation

$$X(u,\, 0,\, a) = X_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, a).$$

5 Proof of the Main Theorem

Our objective in this section is to prove the conjugation formula for long-root type generators,

$$gX(u,\, 0,\, a)g^{-1} = X(\phi(g)u,\, 0,\, a),$$

and to complete our proof of the Main Theorem.

Lemma 26. *For any $u \in V$, any $a,\, b \in R$ and any index i, one has*

$${}^{X_{i,-i}(b)}X(u,\, 0,\, a) = X(T_{i,-i}(b)u,\, 0,\, a).$$

Proof. Choosing $j \notin \{\pm i\}$ and decomposing $X(u,\, 0,\, a)$ with the use of Lemmas 22 and 23, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &X_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, a) = \\ &\quad = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where $v = e_iu_i + e_{-i}u_{-i}$, $v' = e_ju_j + e_{-j}u_{-j}$, $\tilde{\tilde{u}} = u - v - v'$. Observe that

$$e_i\big(T_{i,-i}(b)u\big)_i + e_{-i}\big(T_{i,-i}(b)u\big)_{-i} = T_{i,-i}(b)v$$

and, obviously,

$$e_j\big(T_{i,-i}(b)u\big)_j + e_{-j}\big(T_{i,-i}(b)u\big)_{-j} = v' = T_{i,-i}(b)v'$$

and similarly

$$T_{i,-i}(b)u - T_{i,-i}(b)v - v' = \tilde{\tilde{u}} = T_{i,-i}(b)\tilde{\tilde{u}}.$$

Thus, we only have to check the conjugation formula for the factors of $X(u,\,0,\,a)$ in the above decomposition. Indeed, $X_{i,-i}(b) \in {}^{(j)}L_1 \cap {}^{(k)}L_1$ for any $k \notin \{\pm i, \pm j\}$, and any factor is equal either to $Y_{(j)}(\hat{u},\,\hat{v},\,\hat{a})$, or to $Y_{(k)}(\hat{u},\,\hat{v},\,\hat{a})$ for some $\hat{u},\,\hat{v} \in V$, $\hat{a} \in R$. □

Lemma 27. *For $u,\,v,\,w \in V$ such that*

$$u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0, \qquad v_j = v_{-j} = 0, \qquad w_j = w_{-j} = 0,$$

and $\langle u,\,v\rangle = 0$, $\langle u,\,w\rangle = 0$, $\langle v,\,w\rangle = 0$, one has

$$Y(u,\,v,\,0)Y(u,\,w,\,0) = Y(u,\,v+w,\,0).$$

Proof. Firstly, using $[a,\,bc] = [a,\,b]\cdot {}^{b}[a,\,c]$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Y(u,\,v+w,\,0) = [Y(e_j,\,u,\,0),\,Y(e_{-j},\,(v+w)\varepsilon_j,\,0)] = \\ = Y(u,\,v,\,0)\cdot {}^{Y(e_{-j},\,v\varepsilon_j,\,0)}Y(u,\,w,\,0). \end{aligned}$$

Now, observe that $Y_{(i)}(u,\,w,\,0) \in {}^{(-j)}P_1$ commutes with $Y(e_{-j},\,v\varepsilon_j,\,0)$. □

Lemma 28. *Let $v,\,v' \in V$ be vectors having only $\pm i$-th and $\pm j$-th non-zero coordinates respectively; consider also $v'' \in V$ such that $(v'')_i = (v'')_{-i} = (v'')_j = (v'')_{-j} = 0$. Set $w = v' + v''$. Then*

$$Y(v'',\,v,\,0)Y(v',\,v,\,0) = Y_{(i)}(w,\,v,\,0).$$

Remark. We use this lemma only for the case where v'' has only $\pm k$-th non-zero coordinates. If w has at least 2 pairs of non-zero coordinates, the claim is an obvious consequence of Lemmas 24 and 22. This means that both Lemmas 28 and 27 are only required in the case $l = 3$ and are not relevant when $l \geq 4$.

Proof. Using Lemma 23 one has

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{(i)}(w,\,v,\,0) = Y_{(i)}(w,\,0,\,-v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i)Y(e_i,\,wv_i,\,0)Y(e_{-i},\,wv_{-i},\,0) = \\ = Y(v'',\,0,\,-v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i)Y(v',\,0,\,-v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i)Y(v'',\,-v'v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i,\,0)\cdot \\ \cdot Y(e_i,\,v''v_i,\,0)Y(e_i,\,v'v_i,\,0)Y(e_{-i},\,v''v_{-i},\,0)Y(e_{-i},\,v'v_{-i},\,0). \end{aligned}$$

We want to change the order of factors in the above product to obtain $Y(v'',\,v,,0)$, more precisely, we want to put $Y(e_i,\,v''v_i,\,0)$ and $Y(e_{-i},\,v''v_{-i},\,0)$ right after the first factor. Since $Y_{(k)}(v',\,0,\,-v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i)$ and $Y_{(j)}(v'',\,-v'v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i,\,0)$ lie in ${}^{(i)}L_1$, this elements commute with both $Y(e_i,\,v''v_i,\,0)$ and $Y(e_{-i},\,v''v_{-i},\,0)$.

But $Y(e_i,\, v'v_i,\, 0)$ does not commute with $Y(e_{-i},\, v''v_{-i},\, 0)$, thus we obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned} &Y_{(i)}(w,\, v,\, 0) = \\ &\quad = Y(v'',\, v,\, 0)Y(v',\, 0,\, -v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i)Y(v'',\, -v'v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i,\, 0)Y(e_i,\, v'v_i,\, 0)\cdot \\ &\qquad\qquad \cdot [Y(e_i,\, -v'v_i,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, -v''v_{-i},\, 0)]Y(e_{-i},\, v'v_{-i},\, 0) \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &[Y(e_i,\, -v'v_i,\, 0),\, Y(e_{-i},\, -v''v_{-i},\, 0)] = \\ &\qquad\qquad = Y(-v'v_i,\, -v''v_{-i}\varepsilon_i,\, 0) = Y(v'',\, v'v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i,\, 0) \in {}^{(i)}L_1 \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 24 and thus this element commutes with $Y(e_i,\, v'v_i,\, 0)$. Further, by Lemma 27 one has

$$Y(v'',\, -v'v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i,\, 0)Y(v'',\, v'v_iv_{-i}\varepsilon_i,\, 0) = Y(v'',\, 0,\, 0) = 1.$$

Plugging this into the above formula, we get the claim. □

Lemma 29. *For any $j \notin \{\pm k\}$, any $u \in V$ and any $a,\, b \in R$, one has*

$$^{X_{jk}(b)}X(u,\, 0,\, a) = X(T_{jk}(b)u,\, 0,\, a).$$

Proof. Fix $i \notin \{\pm j, \pm k\}$. Combining Lemmas 22, 24 and 28 we get

$$\begin{aligned} &X_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, a) = \\ &\quad = Y_{(i)}(\tilde{u},\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, v''a,\, 0)Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0) = \\ &\qquad\qquad = Y_{(i)}(\tilde{u},\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y_{(i)}(w,\, va,\, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$v = e_iu_i + e_{-i}u_{-i}, \qquad \tilde{u} = u - v, \qquad v' = e_ju_j + e_{-j}u_{-j}, \qquad \tilde{\tilde{u}} = \tilde{u} - v',$$

$$v'' = e_ku_k + e_{-k}u_{-k}, \qquad \tilde{\tilde{\tilde{u}}} = \tilde{\tilde{u}} - v'', \qquad w = v' + v''.$$

Observe that

$$e_i\big(T_{jk}(b)u\big)_i + e_{-i}\big(T_{jk}(b)u\big)_{-i} = v = T_{jk}(b)v,$$

$$e_j\big(T_{jk}(b)u\big)_j + e_{-j}\big(T_{jk}(b)u\big)_{-j} + e_k\big(T_{jk}(b)u\big)_k + e_{-k}\big(T_{jk}(b)u\big)_{-k} = T_{jk}(b)w,$$

$$T_{jk}(b)u - v = T_{jk}(b)\tilde{u} \quad \text{and} \quad T_{jk}(b)u - v - T_{jk}(b)w = T_{jk}(b)\tilde{\tilde{\tilde{u}}}.$$

Since $Y_{(j)}(v,\, 0,\, a)$ and $Y_{(j)}(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)$ lie in ${}^{(k)}L_1$ they commute with $X_{jk}(b) = Y(e_{-k},\, -e_jae_k,\, 0)$. Now, using $X_{jk}(b) \in {}^{(i)}L_1$ we obtain the claim. □

Corollary. *Lemmas* 26 *and* 29 *imply that for any* $g \in \mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R)$*, one has*

$$gX(u,\, 0,\, a)g^{-1} = X(\phi(g)u,\, 0,\, a).$$

Lemma 30. *The set of elements* $\{X(u,\, 0,\, a) \mid u \in V,\ a \in R\}$ *generates* $\mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R)$ *as a group.*

Proof. Firstly, choosing some i and j such that $\mathrm{Card}\{\pm i, \pm j\} = 4$ one has

$$X_{(j)}(e_i,\, 0,\, a) = Y(e_i,\, 0,\, a)Y(0,\, 0,\, a)Y(0,\, e_i a,\, 0) = Y(e_i,\, 0,\, a) = X_{i,-i}(a).$$

Now, choosing $k \notin \{\pm i, \pm j\}$, taking $u = e_{-k}$, $v = -e_j\varepsilon_k$ and any $a \in R$, and using Lemma 23 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X_{jk}(a) = Y(u,\, va,\, 0) = \\ = Y(v,\, 0,\, -a)Y(u,\, 0,\, -a)Y_{(i)}(u+v,\, 0,\, a) = \\ = X_{(i)}(v,\, 0,\, -a)X_{(i)}(u,\, 0,\, -a)X_{(i)}(u+v,\, 0,\, a). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of the Main Theorem. The Main Theorem asserts that

$$\mathrm{Ker}\,\phi \subseteq \mathrm{Cent}\,\mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R).$$

Indeed, any $g \in \mathrm{Ker}\,\phi$ commutes with the long-type transvections $X(u,\, 0,\, a)$ by Lemmas 26 and 29, so that it is central by Lemma 30. □

6 Relations among ESD-generators

In the two remaining sections we establish another presentation for the symplectic Steinberg group, similar to the one obtained by van der Kallen in the linear case [51].

Lemma 31. *For* $u \in V$*,* $a,\, b \in R$ *one has*

$$X(u,\, 0,\, a)X(u,\, 0,\, b) = X(u,\, 0,\, a+b).$$

Proof. Choosing $j \notin \{\pm i\}$ and decomposing $X(u,\, 0,\, a)$ with the use of Lemmas 22, 23 and 24, one has

$$\begin{aligned} X(u,\, 0,\, a) = \\ = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, 0,\, a)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, v'a,\, 0)Y(v,\, 0,\, a)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, va,\, 0)Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{\tilde{u}}$, v and v' are orthogonal to $\tilde{\tilde{u}}$, the vector u is also orthogonal to $\tilde{\tilde{u}}$, and thus

$$^{Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,0,\,b)}X(u,\,0,\,a) = X(T(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,0,\,b)u,\,0,\,a) = X(u,\,0,\,a).$$

By Lemma 21 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &X(u,\,0,\,a)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,0,\,b) = \\ &= Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,0,\,a+b)Y(v',\,0,\,a)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,v'a,\,0)Y(v,\,0,\,a)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,va,\,0)Y(v,\,v'a,\,0). \end{aligned}$$

The same argument as above shows that $Y(v',\,0,\,b)$ commutes with both $X(u,\,0,\,a)$ and $Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,0,\,a+b)$, so that again by Lemma 21

$$\begin{aligned} X(u,\,0,\,a)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,0,\,b)Y(v',\,0,\,b) = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,0,\,a+b)Y(v',\,0,\,a+b)\cdot \\ \cdot Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,v'a,\,0)Y(v,\,0,\,a)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\,va,\,0)Y(v,\,v'a,\,0). \end{aligned}$$

Repeating this procedure, one eventually obtains the desired result. □

Lemma 32. *For $u \in V$ such that $u_i = u_{-i} = u_j = u_{-j} = 0$ and a, $b \in R$, one has*

$$Y(ub,\,0,\,a) = Y(u,\,0,\,ab^2).$$

Proof. Decompose $Y(ub,\,0,\,a)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{(i)}(ub,\,0,\,a) &= [Y(e_i,\,ub,\,0),\,Y(e_{-i},\,0,\,a)]Y(e_{-i},\,uba\varepsilon_{-i},\,0) = \\ &= [Y_{(j)}(-u,\,-e_ib),\,Y(e_{-i},\,0,\,a)]Y(e_{-i},\,uba\varepsilon_{-i},\,0) = \\ &= [[Y(e_j,\,-u,\,0),\,Y(e_{-j},\,-e_ib\varepsilon_j,\,0)],\,Y(e_{-i},\,0,\,a)]Y(e_{-i},\,uba\varepsilon_{-i},\,0). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use the Hall–Witt identity

$$^y[[y^{-1},\,z],\,x] = {}^z[y,\,[z^{-1},\,x]]\cdot {}^x[z,\,[x^{-1},\,y]]$$

for $x = Y(e_{-i},\,0,\,a)$, $y = Y(e_j,\,u,\,0)$ and $z = Y(e_{-j},\,-e_ib\varepsilon_j,\,0)$. Observe that

$$Y_{(i)}(ub,\,0,\,a) = [[y^{-1},\,z],\,x]Y(e_{-i},\,uba\varepsilon_{-i},\,0).$$

Using the fact, that both $Y(e_i,\,ub,\,0)$, $Y(e_{-i},\,0,\,a) \in {}^{(j)}L_1$ commute with $Y(e_j,\,u,\,0)$, we get

$$[[y^{-1},\,z],\,x] = {}^y[[y^{-1},\,z],\,x].$$

Next, $[x^{-1}, y] = 1$ using conjugation formula for x^{-1}. Further,

$$[z^{-1}, x] = z^{-1} \cdot {}^{x}z = Y(e_{-j}, e_i b\varepsilon_j, 0)Y(e_{-j}, e_i b\varepsilon_{-j} + e_{-i}a\varepsilon_{-i}b\varepsilon_{-j}, 0) =$$
$$= Y(e_{-j}, e_{-i}ab\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_j, ab^2) = Y(e_{-j}, 0, ab^2)Y(e_{-j}, e_{-i}ab\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_j, 0).$$

Then, using $[a, bc] = [a, b] \cdot {}^{b}[a, c]$ one gets

$$[y, [z^{-1}, x]] = [Y(e_j, u, 0), Y(e_{-j}, 0, ab^2)Y(e_{-j}, e_{-i}ab\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_j, 0)] =$$
$$= [Y(e_j, u, 0), Y(e_{-j}, 0, ab^2)] \cdot {}^{Y(e_{-j}, 0, ab^2)}Y_{(j)}(u, e_{-i}ab\varepsilon_i, 0) =$$
$$= [Y(e_j, u, 0), Y(e_{-j}, 0, ab^2)] \cdot Y(e_{-i}, uab\varepsilon_i, 0).$$

Now,

$$Y(ub, 0, a) =$$
$$= {}^{y}[[y^{-1}, z], x]Y(e_{-i}, uba\varepsilon_{-i}, 0) = {}^{z}[y, [z^{-1}, x]]Y(e_{-i}, uba\varepsilon_{-i}, 0) =$$
$$= {}^{z}[Y(e_j, u, 0), Y(e_{-j}, 0, ab^2)][Y(e_{-j}, -e_i b\varepsilon_j, 0), Y(e_{-i}, uab\varepsilon_i, 0)]$$

At this point, using

$$[Y(e_{-j}, -e_i b\varepsilon_j, 0), Y(e_{-i}, uab\varepsilon_i, 0)] = Y_{(i)}(-e_{-j}b\varepsilon_j, uab, 0) =$$
$$= Y(e_{-j}, uab^2\varepsilon_{-j}, 0) = {}^{z}Y(e_{-j}, uab^2\varepsilon_{-j}, 0)$$

we finally obtain

$$Y(ub, 0, a) = {}^{z}[Y(e_j, u, 0), Y(e_{-j}, 0, ab^2)] \cdot {}^{z}Y_{(j)}(u, 0, ab^2) =$$
$$= {}^{z}Y_{(j)}(u, 0, ab^2) = Y_{(j)}(u, 0, ab^2).$$

□

Lemma 33. *For $u \in V$, a, $b \in R$, one has*

$$X(ub, 0, a) = X(u, 0, ab^2).$$

Proof. Decomposing $X(ub, 0, a)$ with the use of Lemmas 22, 23 and 24, and applying Lemmas 32 and 24, we get

$$X(ub, 0, a) = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}}b, 0, a)Y(v'b, 0, a)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}}b, v'ba, 0)Y(vb, 0, a)\cdot$$
$$\cdot Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}}b, vba, 0)Y(vb, v'ba, 0) = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}}, 0, ab^2)Y(v', 0, ab^2)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}}, v'ab^2, 0)\cdot$$
$$\cdot Y(v, 0, ab^2)Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}}, vab^2, 0)Y(v, v'ab^2, 0) = X(u, 0, ab^2).$$

□

Next, we have to define short-root ESD-generators.

Definition. For $u,\, v \in V$ such that $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, set

$$X(v,\, u,\, 0) = X(v,\, 0,\, -1)X(u,\, 0,\, -1)X(u+v,\, 0,\, 1).$$

Lemma 34. *For $g \in \mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R)$ and $u,\, v \in V$ such that $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, $a \in R$, one has*

a) $X(v,\, u,\, 0) = X(u,\, v,\, 0)$;

b) $g\, X(v,\, u,\, 0)g^{-1} = X(\phi(g)u,\, \phi(g)v,\, 0)$;

c) $X(u,\, ua,\, 0) = X(u,\, 0,\, 2a)$.

Proof. Since *a)* and *b)* are obvious, it remains only to check *c)*. By the very definition we have

$$X(u,\, ua,\, 0) = X(u,\, 0,\, -1)X(ua,\, 0,\, -1)X(ua+u,\, 0,\, 1).$$

Then, using Lemma 33 and then Lemma 31, we get

$$\begin{aligned} X(u,\, 0,\, -1)X(ua,\, 0,\, -1)X(ua+u,\, 0,\, 1) = \\ = X(u,\, 0,\, -1)X(u,\, 0,\, -a^2)X(u,\, 0,\, (a+1)^2) = X(u,\, 0,\, 2a). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 35. *Consider $u,\, w \in V$ such that*

$$\langle u,\, w\rangle = 0, \qquad w_i = w_{-i} = w_j = w_{-j} = 0.$$

Then

$$X(u+w,\, 0,\, a) = X(u,\, 0,\, a)X(w,\, 0,\, a)Y(w,\, ua,\, 0).$$

Proof. Set $v = e_i u_i + e_{-i}u_{-i}$, $\tilde{u} = u - v$ and observe that $\langle w,\, v\rangle = \langle w,\, \tilde{u}\rangle = 0$. By the very definition one has

$$X(u+w,\, 0,\, a) = Y_{(i)}(\tilde{u}+w,\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, (\tilde{u}+w)a,\, 0).$$

Further, set $v' = e_j u_j + e_{-j}u_{-j}$ and $\tilde{\tilde{u}} = \tilde{u} - v'$. Since $X(\hat{u},\, 0,\, \hat{a})$ is well-defined by Lemma 25, one has

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{(i)}(\tilde{u}+w,\, 0,\, a) = X(\tilde{u}+w,\, 0,\, a) = \\ = Y_{(j)}(\tilde{\tilde{u}}+w,\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, (\tilde{\tilde{u}}+w)a,\, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}} + w,\, 0,\, a) = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, 0,\, a)Y(w,\, 0,\, a)Y(w,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)$$

by Lemma 23 and

$$Y(v',\, (\tilde{\tilde{u}} + w)a,\, 0) = Y(v',\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v',\, wa,\, 0)$$

by Lemma 27, whereas Lemma 22 implies that

$$Y(v,\, (\tilde{u} + w)a,\, 0) = Y(v,\, (\tilde{\tilde{u}} + w)a,\, 0)Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0).$$

Comparing these formulae, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} X(u + w,\, 0,\, a) = \\ = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, 0,\, a)Y(w,\, 0,\, a)Y(w,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v',\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)\cdot \\ \cdot Y(v',\, wa,\, 0)Y(v,\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, wa,\, 0)Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Invoking the usual arguments, it is easy show that the factors in the above product can be reordered as follows

$$\begin{aligned} X(u + w,\, 0,\, a) = \\ = Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)\cdot \\ \cdot Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0)Y(w,\, 0,\, a)Y(w,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, wa,\, 0)Y(v',\, wa,\, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, recall that

$$\begin{aligned} Y(\tilde{\tilde{u}},\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, 0,\, a)Y(v',\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, 0,\, a)Y(v,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, v'a,\, 0) = \\ = X(u,\, 0,\, a) \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} Y(w,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(v,\, wa,\, 0)Y(v',\, wa,\, 0) = \\ = Y(w,\, \tilde{\tilde{u}}a,\, 0)Y(w,\, va,\, 0)Y(w,\, v'a,\, 0) = Y(w,\, ua,\, 0) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemmas 24 and 22. □

The next lemma is an easy corollary of the previous one.

Lemma 36. *For $v \in V$ such that $v_{-i} = 0$, one has*

$$X(e_i,\, v,\, 0) = Y(e_i,\, v,\, 0).$$

Proof. In the statement of Lemma 35 take $u = v$, $w = e_i$, $a = 1$. □

Lemma 37. *Consider $a \in R$ and $u, v \in V$ such that $\langle u, v\rangle = 0$ and assume also that v is a column of a symplectic elementary matrix. Then*

$$X(u + v, 0, a) = X(u, 0, a)X(v, 0, a)X(v, ua, 0).$$

Proof. Take $g \in \mathrm{StSp}(2l, R)$ such that $\phi(g)v = e_i$. Then,

$$g\,X(u + v, 0, a)g^{-1} = X(\phi(g)u + e_i, 0, a).$$

Now, Lemma 35 (and Lemma 36) imply that

$$X(\phi(g)u + e_i, 0, a) = X(\phi(g)u, 0, a)X(e_i, 0, a)X(e_i, \phi(g)ua, 0) = \\ = g\,X(u, 0, a)X(v, 0, a)X(v, ua, 0)g^{-1}.$$

□

The next lemma is an obvious consequence of the previous one.

Lemma 38. *Assume that both u and v are columns of symplectic elementary matrices such that $\langle u, v\rangle = 0$. Then for any $a \in R$ one has*

$$X(u, va, 0) = X(v, ua, 0).$$

Lemma 39. *Let $u \in V$ be column of a symplectic elementary matrix and let $v, w \in V$ be arbitrary columns such that $\langle u, v\rangle = \langle u, w\rangle = 0$. Then*

$$X(u, v, 0)X(u, w, 0) = X(u, v + w, 0)X(u, 0, \langle v, w\rangle).$$

Proof. Use the same trick as in Lemma 37. □

Definition. For $u, v \in V$ such that $\langle u, v\rangle = 0$, $a \in R$, set

$$X(u, v, a) = X(u, v, 0)X(u, 0, a).$$

Lemma 40. *Assume that u, u' are columns of symplectic elementary matrices, and let v, v', $w \in V$ be arbitrary columns such that $\langle u, v\rangle = \langle u, w\rangle = 0$, $\langle u', v'\rangle = 0$. Then for any a, $b \in R$ one has*

a) $X(u, v, a)X(u, w, b) = X(u, v + w, a + b + \langle v, w\rangle)$,

b) If v is also a column of a symplectic elementary matrix, then $X(u, va, 0) = X(v, ua, 0)$,

c) $X(u', v', b)X(u, v, a)X(u', v', b)^{-1} = \\ = X(T(u', v', b)u, T(u', v', b)v, a)$.

Proof. For *a)* use Lemmas 39 and 31, *b)* and *c)* were already checked. □

7 Symplectic van der Kallen group

Definition. Let the symplectic van der Kallen group $\mathrm{StSp}^*(2l,\, R)$ be the group defined by the set of generators

$$\big\{X^*(u,\, v,\, a)\,\big|u,\, v \in V,\ u \text{ is a column of a symplectic elementary matrix, } \langle u,\, v\rangle = 0,\ a \in R\big\}$$

and relations

$$X^*(u,\, v,\, a)X^*(u,\, w,\, b) = X^*(u,\, v+w,\, a+b+\langle v,\, w\rangle), \tag{P1}$$

$$X^*(u,\, va,\, 0) = X^*(v,\, ua,\, 0) \text{ where } v \text{ is also a column of a symplectic elementary matrix,} \tag{P2}$$

$$X^*(u',\, v',\, b)X^*(u,\, v,\, a)X^*(u',\, v',\, b)^{-1} = X^*(T(u',\, v',\, b)u,\, T(u',\, v',\, b)v,\, a), \tag{P3}$$

Remark. Clearly, Lemma 40 amounts to the existence of a homomorphism

$$\varpi\colon \mathrm{StSp}^*(2l,\, R) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R),$$

sending $X^*(u,\, v,\, a)$ to $X(u,\, v,\, a)$, which is obviously surjective. Furthermore, P3 implies that ϖ is in fact a central extension.

We have to construct the inverse isomorphism from the Steinberg group to the van der Kallen group. Let us start with the following lemma.

Lemma 41. *For $u,\, v \in V$, where u is column of a symplectic elementary matrix, such that $\langle u,\, v\rangle = 0$, $u_i = u_{-i} = v_i = v_{-i} = 0$, and for any $a,\, b \in R$ one has*

$$[X^*(e_i,\, ub,\, 0),\, X^*(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)] = X^*(u,\, vb,\, ab^2)X^*(e_{-i},\, uab\varepsilon_i,\, 0).$$

Proof. Observe that $X^*(\hat{u},\, \hat{v},\, 0)^{-1} = X^*(\hat{u},\, -\hat{v},\, 0)$ by P1, so that

$$[X^*(e_i,\, ub,\, 0),\, X^*(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)] = X^*(u,\, e_ib,\, 0) \cdot {}^{X^*(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)}X^*(u,\, -e_ib,\, 0)$$

by P2. Then,

$$X^*(u,\, e_ib,\, 0) \cdot {}^{X^*(e_{-i},\, v\varepsilon_i,\, a)}X^*(u,\, -e_ib,\, 0) = X^*(u,\, e_ib,\, 0)X^*(u,\, -e_ib + e_{-i}ab\varepsilon_i + vb,\, 0)$$

by P3 and finally

$$X^*(u,\, e_ib,\, 0)X^*(u,\, -e_ib + e_{-i}ab\varepsilon_i + vb,\, 0) =$$
$$= X^*(u,\, e_{-i}ab\varepsilon_i + vb,\, ab^2) = X^*(u,\, vb,\, ab^2)X^*(u,\, e_{-i}ab\varepsilon_i,\, 0)$$

by P1. Now, the claim is obvious by P2. □

Definition. Set

$$X^*_{ij}(a) = X^*(e_i,\, e_{-j}a\varepsilon_{-j},\, 0) \text{ for } i \notin \{\pm j\},$$
$$X^*_{i,\,-i}(a) = X^*(e_i,\, 0,\, a).$$

Lemma 42. *Steinberg relations* R0–R5 *hold for* $X^*_{ij}(a)$ *and* $X^*_{i,-i}(a)$.

Proof. Indeed, P2 implies R0 and P1 implies R1. To establish R1 one has to consider two cases, where $j \neq -i$ and where $j = -i$, respectively. To establish R2 one proceeds as follows. Firstly, one has to consider three cases, where $j \neq -i$, $k \neq -h$, where $j \neq -i$, $k = -h$, and finally, where $j = -i$, $k = -h$. In each case using P3 show that $X^*_{ij}(a)$ commutes with $X^*_{hk}(b)$. Relations R3 and R4 follow directly from Lemma 41. More precisely, it is easier to obtain a version of R4, where the factors in the commutator are interchanged, rather than R4 itself. Finally, we proceed with R5. Using P2 and then P1 we get

$$[X^*_{ij}(a),\, X^*_{j,-i}(b)] = [X^*(e_i,\, -e_{-j}a\varepsilon_j,\, 0),\, X^*(e_i,\, -e_jb\varepsilon_{-i},\, 0)] =$$
$$= X^*(e_i,\, 0,\, 2ab\varepsilon_i).$$

□

Remark. By Lemma 41 it follows that

$$X^*(e_i,\, 0,\, 2a) = X^*_{i,-i}(2a) = [X^*_{ij}(a),\, X^*_{j,-i}(\varepsilon_i)] = X^*(e_i,\, e_ia,\, 0).$$

Corollary. *There is a homomorphism*

$$\varrho\colon \mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R) \to \mathrm{StSp}^*(2l,\, R)$$

sending $X_{ij}(a)$ *to* $X^*_{ij}(a)$. *Obviously,* $\varpi\varrho = 1$, *i.e.* ϱ *is a splitting for* ϖ.

It remains only to verify that $\varrho\varpi = 1$. From a technical viewpoint, it is much more convenient not to proceed directly, but to invoke the following fact (see [8, 51] for the proof).

Lemma 43. *Let $\pi\colon G \twoheadrightarrow H$ be a splitting central extension with G perfect. Then π is in fact an isomorphism.*

It remains to show that van der Kallen group is perfect.

Lemma 44. *For $v \in V$ such that $v_{-i} = 0$, set*

$$v_- = \sum_{i<0} e_i v_i \qquad \textit{and similarly} \qquad v_+ = \sum_{i>0} e_i v_i.$$

Then

$$X^*(e_i,\, v,\, a) = X^*_{i,-i}(a + 2v_i - v_i\varepsilon_i - \langle v_-,\, v_+\rangle)\cdot \\ \cdot X^*_{-l,-i}(v_{-l}\varepsilon_i)\dots X^*_{-1,-i}(v_{-1}\varepsilon_i)X^*_{1,-i}(v_1\varepsilon_i)\dots X^*_{l,-i}(v_l\varepsilon_i).$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 7 works in this situation almost verbatim. One only has to recall that $[X^*(e_i,\, 0,\, b),\, X^*(e_i,\, \hat{v},\, \hat{a})] = 1$ by P1 and that $X^*(e_i,\, 0,\, 2a) = X^*(e_i,\, e_i a,\, 0)$. □

Lemma 45. *The group* $\mathrm{StSp}^*(2l,\, R)$ *is perfect.*

Proof. Firstly, observe that $X^*_{ij}(a)$ lie in $[\mathrm{StSp}^*(2l,\, R),\, \mathrm{StSp}^*(2l,\, R)]$ by relations R3 and R4. Thus, $X^*(e_i,\, v,\, a)$ also lie in the commutator subgroup by Lemma 44. Now, P3 implies that any generator $X^*(u,\, v,\, a)$ lies in the commutator subgroup. Indeed, this is obvious since u is a column of a symplectic elementary matrix. □

Now, it follows that $\mathrm{StSp}^*(2l,\, R) \cong \mathrm{StSp}(2l,\, R)$.

References

[1] Bak A. *Algebraic K-Theory and Its Geometric Applications*, volume 967 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, chapter On modules with quadratic forms, pages 55–66. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1969.

[2] Bak A. *The stable structure of quadratic modules.* Thesis, Columbia University, 1969.

[3] Bak A. *K-Theory of Forms*, volume 98 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1981.

[4] Bak A. and Tang Guoping. Stability for Hermitian K_1. *J. Pure Appl. Alg.*, 150:107–121, 2000.

[5] Bak A. and Vavilov N. Normality for elementary subgroup functors. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 118(1):35–47, 1995.

[6] Bak A. and Vavilov N. Structure of hyperbolic unitary groups I: Elementary subgroups. *Algebra Colloq.*, 7(2):159–196, 2000.

[7] Hahn A. and O'Meara O. *The Classical Groups and K-Theory.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[8] Lavrenov A. On odd unitary Steinberg group. arXiv:1303.6318.

[9] Lavrenov A. Unitary Steinberg group is centrally closed. *St. Petersburg Math. J.*, 24(5):783–794, 2013.

[10] Stavrova A. *Structure of isotropic reductive groups.* PhD thesis, Saint-Petersburg State University, 2009.

[11] Stepanov A. *Stability conditions in the theory of linear groups over rings.* PhD thesis, Leningrad State University, 1987.

[12] Stepanov A. On the normal structure of the general linear group over a ring. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 95(2):2146–2155, 1999.

[13] Stepanov A. Structure of Chevalley groups over rings via universal localization. *J. K-Theory*, 2014. to appear.

[14] Stepanov A. and Vavilov N. Decomposition of transvections: a theme with variations. *K-Theory*, 19:109–153, 2000.

[15] Suslin A. On the structure of the general linear group over polynomial rings. *Soviet Math. Izv.*, 41(2):503–516, 1977.

[16] Suslin A. and Kopeiko V. Quadratic modules and orthogonal groups over polynomial rings. *J. Sov. Math.*, 20(6):2665–2691, 1982.

[17] Li Fuan. The structure of symplectic groups over arbitrary commutative rings. *Acta Math. Sinica*, 3(3):247–255, 1987.

[18] Li Fuan. The structure of orthogonal groups over arbitrary commutative rings. *Chin. Ann. Math.*, 10B(3):341–350, 1989.

[19] Taddei G. Invariance du sous-groupe symplectique élémentaires dans le groupe symplectique sur un anneau. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris (Sér. I)*, 295(2):47–50, 1982.

[20] Taddei G. *Schémas de Chevalley–Demazure: fonctions représentatives et théorème de normalité*. Thèse, Univ. de Genève, 1985.

[21] Taddei G. Normalité des groupes élémentaire dans les groupes de Chevalley sur un anneau. *Contemp. Math.*, 55(2):693–710, 1986.

[22] Tang Guoping. Hermitian groups and K-theory. *K-Theory*, 13(3):209–267, 1998.

[23] Klein I. and Mikhalev A. Steinberg orthogonal group over a ring with involution. *Algebra and Logic*, 9(2):88–103, 1970.

[24] Klein I. and Mikhalev A. Unitary Steinberg group over a ring with involution. *Algebra and Logic*, 9(5):305–312, 1970.

[25] Milnor J. *Introduction to Algebraic K-Theory*. Princeton University Press, 1971.

[26] Suzuki K. Normality of the elementary subgroups of twisted Chevalley groups over commutative rings. *J. Algebra*, 175(2):526–536, 1995.

[27] Vaserstein L. On normal subgroups of GL_n over a ring. *Lecture Notes Math.*, 854:456–465, 1981.

[28] Vaserstein L. On normal subgroups of Chevalley groups over commutative rings. *Tôhoku Math. J.*, 38:219–230, 1986.

[29] Vaserstein L. Normal subgroups of orthogonal groups over commutative rings. *Amer. J. Math.*, 110(5):955–973, 1988.

[30] Vaserstein L. Normal subgroups of symplectic groups over rings. *K-Theory*, 2(5):647–673, 1989.

[31] Vaserstein L. and Mikhalev A. The normal subgroups of the orthogonal group over a ring with involution. *Algebra and Logic*, 9(6):375–377, 1970.

[32] Vaserstein L. and You Hong. Normal subgroups of classical groups over rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 105:93–105, 1995.

[33] Stein M. Generators, relations, and coverings of Chevalley groups over commutative rings. *Amer. J. Math.*, 93(4):965–1004, 1971.

[34] Stein M. The schur multipliers of $\mathrm{Sp}_6(\mathbb{Z})$, $\mathrm{Spin}_8(\mathbb{Z})$, $\mathrm{Spin}_7(\mathbb{Z})$, and $\mathrm{F}_4(\mathbb{Z})$. *Math. Ann.*, 215:165–172, 1975.

[35] Stein M. Stability theorems for K_1, K_2 and related functors modeled on Chevalley groups. *Japan J. Math.*, 4:77–108, 1978.

[36] Tulenbaev M. Schur multiplier of a group of elementary matrices of finite order. *J. Sov. Math.*, 17(4):2062–2067, 1981.

[37] Wendt M. On homotopy invariance for homology of rank two groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 216(10):2291–2301, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.jpaa.2012.03.004.

[38] Vavilov N. *Subgroups of split classical groups*. Dr. Sci. Thesis, Leningrad State University, 1987.

[39] Vavilov N. Structure of split classical groups over commutative rings. *Soviet Math. Doklady*, 37:550–553, 1988.

[40] Hazrat R. Dimension theory and nonstable K_1 of quadratic modules. *K-Theory*, 27:293–328, 2002.

[41] Hazrat R. *On K-theory of classical-like groups*. Doktorarbeit, Bielefeld Univ., 2002.

[42] Hazrat R. and Vavilov N. Bak's work on K-theory of rings. *J. K-Theory*, 4:1–65, 2009. with an appendix by Max Karoubi.

[43] Steinberg R. *Lectures on Chevalley groups*. Yale University, 1967.

[44] Sinchuk S. *Parabolic factorizations of reductive groups*. PhD thesis, Saint-Petersburg State University, 2013.

[45] Kopeiko V. The stabilization of symplectic group over a polynomial ring. *Math. USSR Sbornik*, 34:655–669, 1978.

[46] Petrov V. Odd Unitary Groups. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 130(3):4752–4766, 2003.

[47] Petrov V. Overgroups of unitary groups. *K-Theory*, 29:147–174, 2003.

[48] Petrov V. *Overgroups of classical groups*. PhD thesis, Saint-Petersburg State University, 2005.

[49] Petrov V. and Stavrova A. Elementary subgroups of isotropic reductive groups. *St. Petersburg Math. J.*, 20(4):625–644, 2008.

[50] van der Kallen W. The Schur multipliers of $SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ and $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$. *Math. Ann.*, 212:47–49, 1974.

[51] van der Kallen W. Another presentation for Steinberg groups. *Indag. Math.*, 39(4):304–312, 1977.

[52] van der Kallen W. and Stein M. On the Schur Multipliers of Steinberg and Chevalley Groups over Commutative Rings. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 155(1):83–94, 1977.

[53] Borewicz Z. and Vavilov N. The distribution of subgroups in the general linear groups over a commutative ring. *Proc. Steklov. Inst. Math.*, 3:27–46, 1985.